

WEEKLY JOURNAL

THURSDAY, OCT. 22, 1863.

We are able to state on assurances which we entirely trustworth that the Government will not authorize the enlistment of negroes in Kentucky.

We make this statement, as we are sure every patriot amongst us will receive it, with a profound sense of relief.

We know not what to think of the rapid retreat of Gen. Lee with his whole force toward Richmond and the pursuit by Gen. Meade. It indicates something of great moment—what can only be a matter of conjecture. People cannot but think it strange that an army so great as Lee's, consisting of eighty or ninety thousand men, in so close proximity to the Army of the Potomac, was able to escape and to destroy so great an amount of railroad with so little loss of men.

One supposition in military circles at Washington is, that Gen. Lee has been suddenly recalled by Jeff Davis from his late position to resist General Burnside, who is reported to be making a formidable incursion into Virginia, and even threatening Lynchburg, the base of supplies for Lee's army and Richmond. If this supposition is true, Burnside, after doing what injury he can to the rebel railroads, will of course be compelled to withdraw in haste, for Lee can reach Lynchburg and other important points much sooner than he can and in quadruple force.

Another supposition or rather statement is that Gen. Meade's army is moving onward in two columns, that Lee is fully expected to make a stand, and that a great battle is considered imminent. We greatly fear that, if Lee retains the strength he is said to have had within the last three or four days, and, if he is allowed to choose his position, as of course he must be in case he is attacked, he cannot be attacked successfully. Meade's army, depleted as it has been by the sending of heavy reinforcements to Chattanooga, certainly cannot be more numerous than Lee's, even if it is nearly so numerous and surely a military mind could scarcely expect it to prevail, with all the advantages of position and fortification on the side of its adversary. We hope that Meade is prudent and skillful, and that he is under no ignorant and sinister influences from Washington, for a battle now between the Army of the Potomac and the Army of Virginia would, if the result were a clear victory to us, go very far, if not all the way, to decide the issue of the rebellion.

The New York Post finds fault with the inactivity of both our military and naval forces. It censures Admiral Dahlgren because he fails to attack, and thus emboldens the rebels to venture upon the destruction of vessels by torpedoes; it asserts that Gen. McClellan's "notorious caution" gave the enemy time and opportunity which were embraced by Jackson and Stuart, but it praises the incessant activity of Gen. Mitchell in Northern Alabama, and says "when Buell took command all this ceased; he was a cautious, slow, inactive commander; he preferred the defensive attitude; he left the enemy alone, and the result was that long and inglorious retreat through Tennessee and Kentucky, in which a great army lost heart and a great cause was put to shame." This version of the facts is history, no matter whether it is the result of ignorance or malice.

When General Buell took command here in November, 1861, General Sidney Johnston, with a force of thirty to fifty thousand men, held Bowling Green and all the southern and western parts of the State, and by his railroad facilities could concentrate and mass his troops wherever he desired. Humphrey Marshall was holding all the approaches to the State in the northeast and Zollicoffer in the southwest. General Buell in his statement in review of the evidence before the Military Commission shows that one-third of the State was in possession of the rebel forces, under whose protection a provisional government was organized at Russellville; it was supposed that the Union element was confined, for the most part, to the old men; that the mass of the young men were on the eve of joining the rebel cause, and that nothing but extraordinary exertion and judicious management could rescue the State from the vortex towards which the excitement of revolution rapidly carrying her. This General Buell admits was an unjust reflection on the loyalty of the State, though there was no doubt that the presence of a large rebel force rendered the occasion critical. The effective Federal force in Kentucky at that time consisted of about twenty-three thousand men on the Cumberland Gap road and the Nashville Railroad, and about four thousand on the Big Sandy. There were also forty odd regiments or fractions of regiments scattered over the State more or less available for local service, but unarmed, unequipped, and unorganized. The tedious and difficult task thus imposed on Gen. Buell was performed in the most satisfactory manner, and no one available to the service at that time was equal to its accomplishment but him.

While organizing his army, Gen. Buell suggested to McClellan, then General-in-Chief, his plan for sending a column into East Tennessee, and at the same time for advancing on Nashville. The want of transportation and the heavy rains for the first three months of the year 1862 prevented Gen. Thomas from reaching further than Mill Spring, where he encountered and defeated Zollicoffer, and about the same time Garfield was driving Humphrey Marshall over the Big Sandy and out of the State. The whole plan of attack which gave as Fort Henry, Fort Donelson, and Nashville, was Buell's. Gen. Halleck, then in command of Missouri, had not at first sent force enough to undertake it, and so he told Buell, in reply to a letter written on January 30. The subsequent events of the campaign are well known. Buell never had the force to enter East Tennessee, and the result was that Kirby Smith was enabled to get in the rear of his army and overrun Kentucky. After more than a year of delay Gen. Burnside was sent to Knoxville, where Gen. Thomas might have been in the spring of 1862 if there had been proper cooperation on the part of the War Department, so that Buell could have carried out his original plan of campaign. Gen. Rosecrans now has his left flank protected by the occupation of Knoxville and the railroad, while Buell was continually menaced from that quarter, and eventually was compelled to fall back upon his base of supplies at Louisville. That movement was not an inglorious retreat; our great army did not lose heart, nor had we our great cause put to shame. Gen. Buell had no sooner reached the Ohio river than he commenced his preparations for a renewed advance, and Bragg was driven from the State. The Government now is carrying out our plan's, which he promulgated to Gen. Halleck on January 3, 1862, and which, if the force adequate to the purpose had been raised, would have saved East Tennessee for two years of marching and desolation. Gen. Buell is cautious, but not inactive; he never protracted the defensive, but not the offensive; he did not leave his lines alone, but was continually on the alert, and accomplished all that Rosecrans has as yet effected with but a third part of the force which that able General now has under his command. We have carefully studied the policy of General Buell, both while he was endeavoring to carry it out, and from the masterly arguments which he used in his review of the evidence before the military commission, and there is no officer in the Federal service who has a clearer record, or is entitled to more credit for judicious combinations, skilful managing of a large army, and politic conduct in the occupied territory of an enemy.

The Atlanta Rebels want Bragg to take Louisville. It calls our city "the key of a vast region of country." We guess that it will be a skeleton key before the rebels get it.

We don't think that Bragg is at all remarkable for brains, but we wish we had his head.

Artemus Ward, one of whose peculiarities as a lecturer is that he touches upon almost every conceivable subject except the subject of his lecture, is delivering a lecture on "Ghosts," which he concludes with a capital hit at the disunionists North and South. "The last subject of which I thought," says Artemus, "was the war. When I was an apprentice to the printing business, in New Hampshire, having had a controversy with my employer, I ran away. I had no money, and could not beg, so I called at a farm-house and asked if they had any clocks to mend. They said yes, and wished I would fix it. I took the clock to pieces, ate at the table, and then locked at the table, when lay the clock wheels. I knew that I never could put that clock together again. So I told the folks I was dizzy, and would go out and get some fresh air, and I fled across the meadows like the bright-eyed gosse, or anything else that goes quick. Those politicians who went to work to take the Union clock to pieces to get their dinners, never meant to put it together again. They have stolen their dinner, but they will not restore the clock. I haven't told you much about the ghosts, and it is so late now that there is not time. But I shall speak in San Francisco in about four weeks from this time, and all who hold tickets to this lecture will be admitted free." By the way, we suppose the engagement mentioned in this last sentence is the one upon the tapis when Artemus, being interrogated by telegraph from San Francisco as to what he would take, replied by the return lightning: "Brandy and water!" But to the hit of the inimitable "showman" is a palpable one. The radical politicians North and South, as the Buffalo Courier says, had a jubilant time together, a year or two ago, taking the Union clock to pieces. They could not do their infernal work quickly enough. "Without a little blood-letting," said Zack Chandler, of Michigan, "his Union will not, in my estimation, be worth a curse." "Let the Union slide," said others of the black-hearted gang. And those who saw the consequences of their partial efforts were "weak, womanly Union-savers," of whom Massachusetts Wilson said scoffingly: "This sitting up with the Union does not pay expenses." And so piece by piece, wheel by wheel, they took the Union clock to pieces. The Southern rebels who took part in the operation have made nothing by it, but the Northern disunionists, including office-holders of all grades, civil and military, contractors, &c., are now "dining" glutonously at the nation's expense. And the country has the broken, disjointed "clock" upon its hands, which the radical quacks in clock-mending never meant, and never mean to put together again. And, strange as it may seem, the only "loyal" and "unconditional Union" men now in the country are the bogus clock-makers.

FIENDISH ASSASSINATION.—A murder, attended by circumstances of unusual brutality, was committed on the 30th ult., the perpetrators of which were two young men, who were to be brothers from their strong resemblance to each other. It occurred at a small, unfeudated church near West Point, at the mouth of Salt River, above our city. These two young men went to farmer McCoy's house, and asked to be accommodated for the night, but, as he was unprepared for such duties, and they were so near the village, he declined to accommodate them. They went away, but soon returned with an old man, named Hamilton, from Glasgow, Ky., and who told McCoy he would pay the expenses of the party, if they were permitted to remain. McCoy still refused, pleading his inability to grant their request. They started off again to the little church near by for the night. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in which we have had more men killed in battle than we have claimed to have in the field. It says Humphrey Marshall killed 200, and wounded more than that number, at Middle Creek; that at Fort Donelson our losses were 7,000 killed, to say nothing of the wounded; at Shiloh 23,000 is the modest total of our casualties; at Manassas, 11,000; at Richmond, Ky., 11,000; at Munfordville, 6,000; at Perryville, 20,000; at Hartsville, Tenn., 2,000; and there is hardly a skirmish recorded in

